



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,038	04/30/2001	Brian T. Murren	GE1-008US	5210
21718 7590 07/06/2007 LEE & HAYES PLLC SUITE 500 421 W RIVERSIDE SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER PAULA, CESAR B	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhpto@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/847,038	Applicant(s) MURREN ET AL.	
	Examiner CESAR B. PAULA	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30 and 34-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, and 34-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE amendment filed on 4/30/2007.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, and 34-37 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, 20, 26, 34, and 36 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, and 34-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hitchcock et al, hereinafter Hitchcock (Pat.# 6,345,278 B1, 2/5/2002, filed on 6/3/1999), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 4/30/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this

Art Unit: 2178

subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 20-27, 29, 30, and 34-37 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hitchcock et al, hereinafter Hitchcock (Pat.# 6,345,278 B1, 2/5/2002, filed on 6/3/1999).

Regarding independent claim 20, Hitchcock teaches creating a form in accordance to an institution's request, such as using template files. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form fields to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution— *determining one or more attributes that are used by the business logic but not obtained by the business logic elsewhere other than the form definition, and using after determining the one or more attributes...* (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.8, lines 60-col.9, line 20, col.15, lines 27-46, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Further, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form—*request--*, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data— *the determining is based at least in part on one or more interactions associated with the business logic* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27). The form requesting a review of the information included therein, is coded using a format such as HTML code-- *each of the one or more processing interactions being associated with a request to be processed by the business logic and including, one or more command definitions to process the request;*

Furthermore, Hitchcock discloses replacing directives with appropriate validation code in html for validating the form fields—including validation code in the form definition associated with the defined one or more fields-- (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 20, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 20, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data. A second stage validation is performed when the form is submitted to an institution (col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 67).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 20, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data. A second stage validation is performed when the form is submitted to an institution —*identification of additional restrictions and*

receiving from the business logic, the identification of the additional restrictions--

(col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 67).

Claims 24-25 are directed towards a computer program product on a computer-readable medium for storing computer-executable instructions for performing the steps found in claim 22, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 26, Hitchcock teaches creating a form in accordance to an institution's request, such as using template files. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form fields to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.8, lines 60-col.9, line 20, col.15, lines 27-46, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Further, Hitchcock discloses replacing directives with appropriate validation code in html for validating the form fields—*validation code from the tag library to verify that a subsequent input to the data field satisfies the one or more automatically identified restrictions* (col.10, lines 40-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27). In other words, the html code associated with the validation information for the form fields, is retrieved from a file source, such as a data structure—*tag library--*.

Furthermore, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form—*request--*, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*identifying one or more processing interactions associated with a business logic,*

Art Unit: 2178

wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the generated form; identifying in the one or more interactions one or more attributes that are not obtained elsewhere, but the form (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27). The form requesting a review of the information included therein, is coded using a format such as HTML code-- and wherein each interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request;

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 26, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27)—*automatically identify restrictions, and include in the form definition, the validation code to verify that the subsequent input to the data field.*

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 26, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data. A second stage validation is performed when the form is submitted to an institution (col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 67) —*identifying one or more interactions associated with the business logic, identifying in the one or more processing interactions one or more attributes that are not obtained elsewhere, additional data input fields to be included in the form based at least in part on the*

identification of the one or more attributes not obtained by one or more processing interactions elsewhere.

Regarding claim 30, which depends on claim 34, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 27).

Regarding independent claim 34, Hitchcock discloses a forms engine—*form processing module--* for replacing directives with appropriate validation code, found in a data structure, in html for validating the form fields—*validation code from the tag library to verify that a subsequent input to the data field satisfies the one or more automatically identified restrictions —restrictions in a form definition for the form--* (col.10, lines 40-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 35, which depends on claim 34, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 27).

Regarding independent claim 36, Hitchcock teaches a forms engine—*form processing module--* for creating a form in accordance to an institution's request, such as

Art Unit: 2178

using template files. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form fields to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.8, lines 60-col.9, line 20, col.15, lines 27-46, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Furthermore, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database—*attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interaction elsewhere*, but the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*indicating that the one or more identified attributes are to be obtained via a data input field on a form, and further indicating that an input for the data input field is needed when submitting the form* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29,col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 27).The form requesting a review of the information included therein, is coded using a format such as HTML code-- *includes one or more command definitions for the business logic to process the request;*

Regarding claim 37, which depends on claim 36, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database—*attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interaction elsewhere*, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 27).

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hitchcock as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bernardo et al (USPat. 6684369, 1/27/2004, filed on 6/19/1998).

Regarding independent claim 1, Hitchcock teaches creating a form in accordance to an institution's request. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form fields to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution—*receiving an indication of a desired form to be generated for data input; automatically identifying one or more data input fields to be included on the desired form, and generating, after automatically identifying the one or more data input fields, a form definition including the automatically identified data input fields--* (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.8, lines 60-col.9, line 20, col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.15, lines 27-46, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Furthermore, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form—*request--*, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data— *identifying one or more interactions associated with a business logic, wherein the business logic*

Art Unit: 2178

processes requests subsequently submitted via the form. identifying in the one or more interactions one or more attributes that are not obtained elsewhere, but the form (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27). The form requesting a review of the information included therein, is coded using a format such as HTML code-- and wherein each interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request; Hitchcock fails to explicitly disclose requests subsequently submitted via a form resulting from the desired form. However, Bernardo teaches using a web form for producing input forms to submit information to a website (col. 23, line 48-col. 24, line 31, fig. 26, 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hitchcock, and Bernardo, because of all the reasons found in Bernardo including eliminating the need for a website creator to know or use HTML or other programming languages to create a website (col.2, lines 30-67).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Hitchcock discloses an XML parser for generating applications of form elements including validation rule elements for validating data associated with the form elements—*automatically identifying for each of the one or more input fields, one or more restrictions* (col.21, lines 30-67).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Hitchcock discloses an XML parser for generating applications of form elements including validation rule elements for validating data associated with the form elements—*automatically identifying for each of the one or more input fields, one or more restrictions* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.21, lines 30-67). In other words, the processor requests the data for the display of the fields from a forms

Art Unit: 2178

engine—*requesting and receiving the one or more restrictions from a business logic, which subsequently processes requests submitted via the form.*

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*identifying one or more interactions associated with the business logic, identifying in the one or more interactions one or more attributes that are not obtained elsewhere* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*requesting and receiving the one or more input fields from a business logic, which subsequently processes requests submitted via the form* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 1-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data —*communicating with a business logic to identify one or more input fields* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 8, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—a *plurality of interactions to process requests, comprising an identification of one of the plurality of interactions* or data input into the fields (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding independent claim 10, Hitchcock teaches a forms engine for creating an html form in accordance to an institution's request, such as using template files. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form validation code to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution— *automatically identifying one or more restrictions associated with a data input field; and using, after automatically identifying the one or more restrictions the one or more restrictions and the field to generate a text markup language form definition.--* (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.11, lines 1-col.12, line29, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Furthermore, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user

Art Unit: 2178

on the form—*request--*, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*communicating with a business logic to identify the one or more restrictions, wherein the business logic processes requests which are subsequently submitted via a generated form, the communicating including identifying one or more interactions associated with the business logic, and identifying, in the one or more interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interactions elsewhere*, but the form; (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27). The form requesting a review of the information included therein, is coded using a format such as HTML code-- *and wherein each processing interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request*; Hitchcock fails to explicitly disclose *requests which are subsequently submitted via a generated form, and for use with the generated form*. However, Bernardo teaches using a web form for producing input forms to submit information to a website (col. 23, line 48-col. 24, line 31, fig. 26, 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hitchcock, and Bernardo, because of all the reasons found in , Bernardo including eliminating the need for a website creator to know or use HTML or other programming languages to create a website (col.2, lines 30-67).

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 11, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the

Art Unit: 2178

missing data—*requesting, and receiving from the business logic an identification of the one or more restrictions* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 10, Hitchcock teaches a forms engine for creating an html form in accordance to an institution's request, such as using template files. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form validation code to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution— *automatically identifying the data input field to be included in the text markup language form--* (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.11, lines 1-col.12, line29, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 14, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form— *identifying in the one or more processing interactions one or more attributes that are not obtained elsewhere*, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 14, Hitchcock discloses checking

Art Unit: 2178

the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data —*automatically identifying that a data input to the automatically identified data input field is required when submitting the form* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 10, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form fields, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 10, Hitchcock discloses checking the information, such as text, submitted by the user on the form fields, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, and 34-37, have been considered but are moot. Concerning the arguments that Hitchcock does not teach the generation of a form, since Hitchcock is directed towards form filling and not form

Art Unit: 2178

generation (page 11). The Applicant is directed towards the rejection of the amended subject matter above in light of the newly rejected claims.

Conclusion

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

Art Unit: 2178

- (703) 703-872-9306, {(571)-273-8300 as of July 15, 2005} (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
6/28/2007